

1.0.7 DOC EIA

NICE quality standards

Equality impact assessment

Oesophago-gastric cancer

The impact on equality has been assessed during quality standard development according to the principles of the NICE equality policy.

1. TOPIC ENGAGEMENT STAGE

1.1 Have any potential equality issues been identified during this stage of the development process?
--

No equality issues have been identified at this stage.
--

1.2 Have any population groups, treatments or settings been excluded from coverage by the quality standard at this stage in the process. Are these exclusions justified – that is, are the reasons legitimate and the exclusion proportionate?
--

No equality issues have been identified at this stage.
--

Completed by lead technical analyst Rachel Gick

Date 01/03/2018

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead Nick Ballie

Date 2 March 2018

1.0.7 DOC EIA

2. PRE-CONSULTATION STAGE

2.1 Have any potential equality issues been identified during the development of the quality standard (including those identified during the topic engagement process)? How have they been addressed?

The committee did not identify any specific issues.

Statement 3, which concerns providing specialist, tailored dietetic support, contains information about equality and diversity considerations, in relation to providing accessible information.

Statement 4, which concerns the provision of information (along with other forms of support) by an oesophago-gastric clinical nurse specialist, contains information about equality and diversity considerations, in relation to providing accessible information.

2.2 Have any changes to the scope of the quality standard been made as a result of topic engagement to highlight potential equality issues?

No changes have been made to the scope of the quality standard at this stage.

2.3 Do the draft quality statements make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access services compared with other groups? If so, what are the barriers to, or difficulties with, access for the specific group?

None of the statements will make it more difficult for a specific group to access services. The statements should all enhance equality.

2.4 Is there potential for the draft quality statements to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities because of something that is a consequence of the disability?

No adverse impact on people with disabilities has been identified.

2.5 Are there any recommendations or explanations that the committee could make to remove or alleviate barriers to, or difficulties with, access to services identified in questions 2.1, 2.2 or 2.3, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligation to advance equality?

The equalities sections of statements 3 and 4 highlight ways in which barriers can be removed or alleviated.

1.0.7 DOC EIA

Completed by lead technical analyst Rachel Gick

Date 06/07/2018

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead Nick Ballie

Date 09/07/2018

1.0.7 DOC EIA

3. POST CONSULTATION STAGE

3.1 Have any additional potential equality issues been raised during the consultation stage, and, if so, how has the committee addressed them?
--

The committee did not identify any additional issues at consultation.

3.2 If the quality statements have changed after the consultation stage, are there any that make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access services compared with other groups? If so, what are the barriers to, or difficulties with, access for the specific group?
--

N/A

Completed by lead technical analyst Rachel Gick

Date 5 November September 2018

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead Mark Minchin

Date 8 November 2018

1.0.7 DOC EIA

4. After Guidance Executive amendments – if applicable

4.1 Outline amendments agreed by Guidance Executive below, if applicable:

N/A

Completed by lead technical analyst Rachel Gick

Date 5 December 2018

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead Mark Minchin

Date 5 December 2018

© NICE 2018 All rights reserved. Subject to [Notice of rights](#).